Application No.: 10/683,872

Amendment dated: March 27, 2007

Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: 0002.0004US1

c.) Remarks

Claims 7 and 9-25 are pending in this application. Claims 9, 14, 17, and 19 have

been amended in various particulars as indicated hereinabove. New Claims 21-25 have

been added to alternatively define Applicants' invention. Claims 1-6 and 9 have been

cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant

regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following

reasons.

In independent claim 9, "target" has been changed to "sample" to refer to what the

system is imaging. Thus, it is now clear that the target of claim 18 is the source target.

Claims 7, 9-13 15, 16, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Suckewer (US 5,177,774). This rejection is respectfully traversed for

the following reasons.

Claim 9 requires a reflective condenser that directs the ultraviolet radiation onto a

sample at an angle of between normal to the sample and 7 degrees off normal [emphasis

added].

In contrast, the Suckewer system uses a different configuration. For example

from column 5 of the Suckewer patent:

In the preferred embodiment of the invention, as

shown in FIG. 1, a soft X-ray generator 2, in this exam- 10 ple a soft X-ray laser source 2 is shown, provides a soft

X-ray beam 4 at an angle a of 30° to 60° to the horizon-

tal plane of an object or specimen 6, for example. A

Later in column 6, it provides:

8 of 9

Application No.: 10/683,872 Amendment dated: March 27, 2007

Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2006 Attorney Docket No.: 0002.0004US1

tion object 6 via an ellipsoidal mirror 26. The reflection object 6 was constructed by evaporating gold onto a polished surface through a TEM number 200 grid. The 45 angle of incidence of the 18.2 nm laser beam to the reflection object was limited by the vacuum chamber utilized to 70°, or an angle of 20° between the reflection surface of object 6 and the incident beam 10. The image

In either case, the claimed range is not shown or suggested. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By /grant houston/

J. Grant Houston Registration No.: 35,900

Tel.: 781 863 9991 Fax: 781 863 9931

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421

Date: March 27, 2007